IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DE LAGE LANDEN FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC.,

Plaintiff.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 20-1908

v.

SANJAY SINGH and ROYAL BENGAL LOGISTICS, INC.,

Defendants.

<u>ORDER</u>

AND NOW, this 15th day of May 2020, upon consideration of Defendant Sanjay Singh's Motion for Permission to File Electronically [Doc. No. 8], it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Motion is **GRANTED** and Defendant Singh may file electronically **only on behalf of himself**, not on behalf of Defendant Royal Bengal Logistics, Inc.¹

It is so **ORDERED**.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Cynthia M. Rufe

CYNTHIA M. RUFE, J.

Singh's brief Notice of Appearance is insufficient to establish that Royal Bengal Logistics is, in fact, a sole proprietorship and that allowing Singh to appear on its behalf is appropriate under the circumstances. If Singh wishes to represent Royal Bengal Logistics himself, he must file a motion seeking permission to do so with an accompanying affidavit or other evidence showing that Royal Bengal Logistics is a sole proprietorship owned by Singh. If the Court ultimately determines that it is not appropriate for Singh to represent Royal Bengal Logistics, the documents Singh has filed on behalf of both himself and Royal Bengal Logistics will be stricken.

¹ Defendant Singh entered his *pro se* appearance in a Notice of Appearance that seems to seek leave for Singh to represent both himself and Defendant Royal Bengal Logistics, Inc. *See* Doc. No. 9. As a general matter, individuals who are not attorneys are permitted to represent themselves in federal court, 28 U.S.C. § 1654, but "corporations, partnerships, or associations" may not "appear in federal court otherwise than through a licensed attorney." *Rowland v. Cal. Men's Colony*, 506 U.S. 194, 202 (1993). Based on the law cited in the Notice of Appearance, it seems Singh will contend that he should be permitted to appear on behalf of Royal Bengal Logistics on the grounds that it is a sole proprietorship. *See* Doc. No. 9 (citing *Lowery v. Hoffman*, 188 F.R.D. 651, 653 (M.D. Ala. 1999)).